

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14 and 16-36 are pending in this application. Claim 36 has been canceled without prejudice and claims 1, 25, 26 and 27 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 25, 26 and 27 do not introduce any new subject matter.

CLAIM OBJECTION

The Examiner objects to claim 1 for the reasons stated on page 2 of the July 18, 2007 Office Action. Applicant has amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. As such, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 36 under section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without conceding the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has canceled claim 36, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the section 112 rejection of same.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 14 and 16-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,526,335 ("Treyz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,455 ("Allan").

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz in view of Allan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,317 ("Holloway").

Claims 1, 25, 26 and 27 have been amended to recite that the display device is the primary display device for the system and is positioned overhead on the console for

principal viewing by passengers.

For example, Applicant's disclosure, in Figs. 3 and 4, illustrates overhead mounting arrangements for the console including display devices mounted to the overhead consoles. Applicant's disclosure states that the overhead consoles are mounted against the interior roof of the vehicle. See Applicant's disclosure, page 28, lines 11-17. In addition, Applicant's disclosure states that the console includes the display device, and that passengers can watch media content while the driver concentrates on the task of driving. See Applicant's disclosure, page 13, lines 4-13, page 19, line 17 – page 20, line 3; page 23, line 21 – page 24, line 2. Moreover, Applicant notes that the overhead positioning of the console, so as not to interfere with rear-view mirror operation, and to effectively serve the purpose of providing media to passengers, must place the display device in a position where it is principally viewable by passengers, not by the driver.

Applicant respectfully submits that Treyz fails to disclose the claimed display device, and that there is no motivation to modify Treyz to include the claimed display device, which is the primary display device for the system and is positioned overhead on the console for principal viewing by passengers.

The Examiner admits that Treyz fails to teach an overhead console. In order to cure the deficiency in Treyz, the Examiner relies on Allan, and states that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Treyz to include an automobile personal computer and display in an overhead console in order to arrange conveniently an entertainment system in a vehicle in a manner to save space in the vehicle. See July 18, 2007 Office Action at 4.

However, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, there is no motivation to modify Treyz to include the primary display device for the system that is positioned overhead on the console for principal viewing by passengers.

A Primary Display Device For The System That Is Positioned Overhead On The Console For Principal Viewing By Passengers Is Inconsistent With The Objectives Of Treyz

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed primary display device that is positioned overhead for principle viewing by passengers is inconsistent with Treyz's objectives.

Treyz states that the presently available automobile personal computers are limited in their functionality, and endeavors to provide an automobile personal computer system with increased functionality. See Treyz, col. 1, lines 17-22. Further, Treyz maintains that dashboard mounting of the personal computer system is advantageous, and states that other mounting configurations may be used provided that a user input interface is within reach of the driver, and that ancillary displays and controls may be provided away from the driver. See id. col. 13, lines 12-36. Indeed, the embodiments in Treyz require a primary display to be viewable by the driver. For example, referring to Fig. 6 of Treyz, the automobile personal computer 14 includes a front panel display that is viewable by the driver, and a passenger supplemental display and input unit. See id. Fig. 6 and col. 17, lines 40-49.

As is clear from the disclosure in Treyz, Treyz aims to provide an automobile personal computer that is centered around the front seat, with displays and controls primarily accessible to the driver. Inconsistent with the objectives of Treyz to provide a driver centered computer, overhead positioning of the primary display as claimed would

put the primary display out of reach of the driver, or at least require unwanted straining to view its content. Accordingly, there is no motivation to modify Treyz to include the claimed primary display device that is positioned overhead for principle viewing by passengers.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 1, 25, 26 and 27, and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-12, 14 and 16-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888